



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

C/K  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/600,004	06/18/2003	Graham Edmund Kelly	7579.0015-01000	6037
22852	7590	11/16/2005	EXAMINER	
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413			DELACROIX MUIRHEI, CYBILLE	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1614		

DATE MAILED: 11/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.	10/600,004
Examiner	Cybille Delacroix-Muirheid

Applicant(s)	KELLY ET AL.
Art Unit	1614

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 12 October 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a)  The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on 13 October 2005. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
- (a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
  - (c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
 5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
 6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.  
 Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.  
 Claim(s) rejected: 1-18, 21, 28-35 and 41-45.  
 Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
 9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
 10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
 12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_  
 13.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

*Christopher S. F. Low*  
 CHRISTOPHER S. F. LOW  
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
 TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: of reasons already of record in the office actions mailed April 13, 2005 and June 17, 2004.

In the amendment received Oct. 12, 2005, applicant traverses the examiner's conclusion that the declaration under 132 received Dec. 13, 2004 is ineffective to remove Kelly 6,340,703. Specifically, applicant asserts that based on the September 2000 amendment in the Federal Register, it is clear that a Rule 132 declaration is entirely appropriate to address subject matter that is claimed in a patent or in an application. Therefore, the MPEP section relied upon by the examiner is outdated and incorrect.

These arguments have been considered but are not found to be persuasive.

In view of applicant's arguments, the examiner once again referred to the MPEP, which has been recently revised (Revision 3, August 2005). Contrary to applicant's assertions, MPEP 715.01(a) continues to prescribe that 132 declarations are ineffective to remove, as prior art, a patent which discloses and claims subject matter that is claimed in a later filed application.

The examiner respectfully submits that in order to remove the Kelly patent (6,340,703) as prior art by another, applicant must file, in addition to the 132 declaration, a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) to amend the inventorship of the instant application by requesting deletion of Inventor Husband. Absent such a petition, however, the 132 declaration received Dec. 13, 2004 remains ineffective to remove the Kelly patent as prior art.

Moreover, please note, even upon removal of the Kelly patent, the claims rejection under 35 USC 103(a) would remain for reasons already of record. Please refer to the office actions mailed April 13, 2005 and June 17, 2004. Concerning new claim 45, please refer to Kelly '069, which teaches that the preferred ratio of genistein and/or Biochanin A to daidzein and/or formononetin is between 1:2 to 2:1, with 2:1 falling within the claimed range recited in claim 45 as well as claims 1 and 21.